

## REMARKS

Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for the attention accorded to the instant application, and respectfully requests reconsideration of the application as amended.

### Formal Matters

In this Response, claims 1, 6, 12, 16, 21, 29, 37, 47, and 51 are amended, and claims 2-4, 13-15, 22, 25, 30-31, and 38-39 are canceled. Applicant appreciates that the Examiner finds claims 4, 6, 8, 15, 17, 30, 33, 38, 41 and 43 allowable but objected to for being dependent from rejected base claims.

### Rejection of Claims 1, 5, 12, 16, 21, 29, 37, 40, 47 and 51 Under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1, 5, 12, 16, 21, 29, 37, 40, 47 and 51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Timothy Bickmore et al., "Web Page Filtering and Re-Authoring for Mobile Users", The Computer Journal, Volume 42, No. 6, 1999 (hereinafter "Bickmore") in view of Shindoa Mayumi, Japanese Patent Publication 08-202655 (hereinafter "Mayumi"). This rejection should be withdrawn based on the comments and remarks herein.

The Examiner has stated that at least claims 4, 15, 30 and 38 are allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of base claims and any intervening claims. Accordingly, claim 4 is canceled herein, and the features of claim 4 are incorporated into independent claim 1. Similarly, independent claims 12, 29, and 37 are amended to add the limitations of allowable claims 15, 30, and 38, respectively. Also, independent claims 21, 47 and 51 are amended to include the limitation of "the font

determining unit determines the font while the authenticating unit performs the authentication” as this is the limitation that the Examiner found allowable in at least claims 4, 15, 30 and 38. Thus, independent claims 1, 12, 21, 29, 37, 47 and 51 have been rewritten to incorporate, into each base claim, features and limitations from the allowable claims and the intervening claims, if applicable. Applicant respectfully states that these independent base claims are now allowable.

Claim 5 depends from independent claim 1, claim 16 depends from independent claim 12, and claim 40 depends from independent claim 37. Therefore, claims 5, 16 and 40 incorporate novel and nonobvious features of their respective independent base claims and are patentably distinguishable over the prior art for at least the reasons that their respective base claims are patentably distinguishable over the prior art. Accordingly, this rejection should now be withdrawn.

**Rejection of Claims 3, 14 and 22**

Claims 3, 14 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as obvious from over Bickmore, and being well known in the art. Claims 3, 14 and 22 are canceled herein.

**Rejection of Claims 9-11, 18-20, 26-29, 34-36, 44-46 and 48-50 Under 35 U.S.C. §103**

Claims 9-11, 18-20, 26-29, 34-36, 44-46 and 48-50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being obvious from Bickmore and the Official Notice taken by the Examiner. This rejection should be withdrawn based on the comments and remarks herein.

The Official Notice does not remedy the deficiencies of Bickmore, admitted by

the Examiner and discussed above, as they relate to Applicant's invention as claimed in independent claims 1, 12, 21, 29, 37, and 47. Claims 9-11, 18-20, 26-28, 34-36, 44-46 and 48-50 depend from independent claims 1, 12, 21, 29, 37, and 47, respectively, and thus incorporate novel and nonobvious features thereof. Accordingly, claims 9-11, 18-20, 26-28, 34-36, 44-46 and 48-50 are patentably distinguishable over the prior art for at least the reasons that their respective independent base claims are patentably distinguishable over the prior art. Therefore, this rejection should now be withdrawn.

**Rejection of claims 7, 23, 24, 32 and 42**

Claims 7, 23, 24, 32 and 42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 being unpatentable over Bickmore in view of Mayumi and further in view of Simon, U.S. Patent No. 6,065,008. This rejection should be withdrawn based on the comments and remarks herein.

Simon does not remedy the deficiencies of Bickmore combined with Mayumi as they relate to applicant's invention as recited in independent claims 1, 21, 29 and 37. Therefore, since claims 7, 23-24, 32 and 42 depend from these independent base claims, respectively, claims 7, 23-24, 32 and 42 incorporate novel and nonobvious features thereof and are patentably distinguishable over the prior art for at least the reasons that their respective independent base claims are patentably distinguishable over the prior art. Therefore, this rejection should now be withdrawn.

**Conclusion**

For at least the reasons set forth in the foregoing discussion, Applicant believes that the Application is now allowable and respectfully requests that the Examiner

reconsider the rejections and allow the Application. Should the Examiner have any questions regarding this Amendment, or regarding the Application generally, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,



Katherine R. Vieyra  
Registration No. 47,155

SCULLY, SCOTT, MURPHY & PRESSER, P.C.  
400 Garden City Plaza, Suite 300  
Garden City, New York 11530  
(516) 742-4343  
KRV/vh